



# Moderators' Report/ Principal Moderator Feedback

January 2023

Pearson Edexcel Extended Projects Qualification  
in Artefact (P304)  
Paper 01

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

## **Grade Boundaries**

Grade boundaries for all papers can be found on the website at:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

January 2023

Publications Code P304\_01\_2301\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

## **Student Performance**

We continue to see many high marks and impressive work at the top of the range. This is perhaps because of experienced centres and very dedicated learners pursuing projects linked to their personal passions and progression plans.

There were again few examples of very low marks. In general, the learners that are entered plan, research, develop and produce an artefact.

The unit is accessible to learners of differing ability and larger cohorts included a range of marks.

## **Suitability of work submitted**

Most centres supported learners to develop proposals that necessitated a clear research phase. Most of the work sampled reflected the Guided Learning Hours of the qualification.

On the whole learners submitted appropriate proposals and evidence for the Artefact unit. There were a few instances of learners not defining and focusing on an artefact outcome from the outset. There was very occasional entry of more ephemeral outcomes that could have been better conceived as P303 (Performance) projects.

Sometimes the planning and the structure of the supporting materials were better suited to a Dissertation outcome. In these instances, less effective evidence was presented in the form of an essay/dissertation/literature review with the later addition of an artefact. This could be because centres are modelling a response for a Dissertation as part of the taught course. Therefore, centres are advised to ensure they guide learners to produce appropriate evidence for the demands of the Artefact unit.

Some centres are 'over' evidencing this unit and providing large portfolios that far exceed the recommended word count. Information tended to be repeated in different sections of the portfolio. This had a negative impact as the portfolio overall was less coherent and supporting materials less clear.

Generally, learners developed a suitable initial design brief and/or specification as opposed to a question as their starting point/project title. This enabled them to focus effectively on the design and production of their artefact. There was a tendency for those who focused their work on a question to focus disproportionately on an issue, problem or theme rather than the research and methods required to develop and produce an artefact.

Highly refined initial briefs offered learners the greatest opportunity. Where consideration was given to specifics such as style, medium, influence, purpose, materials, genre, user-group etc. learners were able to plan, research, develop and evaluate with all these in mind. Examples of more focused initial titles/design briefs included:

- Create a board game that simulates a simplified version of the stock market targeting an age range of 10+. The purpose of this game is to set the building blocks of how or why you would want to invest money, specifically using Cryptocurrency to explain
- A lighting design for Chekov's 'Three Sisters' which effectively conveys the theme of time, drawing on lighting principles used by Paule Constable
- A design and prototype to increase the power output of solar panels on commercial 'solar farm' installations using the Seebeck Effect.

Most centres included the required Project Proposal Form and Activity Logs on the Pearson pro-formas.

Stronger responses often recognised the validity of documenting relevant primary research including the development of technical skills and research into existing similar products/designs. Occasionally individuals did not appreciate the technical skills required to realise an appropriate Level 3 artefact and/or the time and support needed to develop these skills.

Some effective supporting materials were less formal in their presentation, but still structured. They were in the most appropriate form for the artefact outcome (e.g. annotated sketchbooks or design portfolios). Centres should be confident to reward this type of evidence when it meets the assessment criteria. Detailed Activity/Production Logs also often provided effective evidence for all objectives.

The switch to electronic evidence, sometimes impacted on the quality of the evidence of the final artefact. There were instances of centres not initially submitting evidence of the final artefact or only providing poor quality black and white images that did not necessarily show the artefact being used/displayed as intended. It is good practice to include filmed evidence of the artefact in use, where appropriate. Some centres made good use of PowerPoint to include images from the design portfolios in their supporting materials. Time lapse photography was also used effectively used to show development.

Most centres recognised the need to provide evidence of both presentation skills and review. Occasionally Oral Presentation Record Forms were not included or fully completed with mark band placement and commentary.

## **Assessment Evidence**

### **AO1**

Some Project Proposals were very detailed, with all sections on the form completed fully. Proposals were particularly effective when they included a detailed breakdown of

the activities that would be completed with the time allocated to each section clearly identified. Some plans were very brief, and this provided weaker evidence for AO1.

Activity Logs provided stronger evidence for AO1 when they were detailed, reflective and included commentary of how the process was managed. When AO1 was over-rewarded initial proposals and time planning were less detailed and focused than the mark suggested. Sometimes titles had not developed from initial vaguer questions into refined briefs.

Better assessment considered the full range of marks in the top band. Where there was slight lenience, it was also often due to more limited and narrative records of activities.

## **AO2**

There were examples of excellent research being conducted and used effectively. The initial research included existing products, the issue to be addressed or the needs of the client, different equipment or materials and different techniques that could be used. On-going research also informed the iterative design and development process. In some examples where evidence was less strong, learners conducted more arbitrary desk-top research around a theme.

AO2 research was sometimes 'narrower' than the centre mark suggested. Sometimes there was over-evidencing of AO2, to the detriment of time spent on the development and realisation of the Artefact (AO3).

Some learners did not reference consistently within their work or produce a bibliography which provided less evidence for AO2, as the bibliography is part of the marking criteria in all mark bands. There was sometimes a lack of awareness of the need to cite the sources of images used in the supporting material or indeed the final artefact.

## **AO3**

At the top end students demonstrated a high level of technical skill and produced very successful outcomes. There was evidence of genuine innovation as students created new artworks, designs and products.

Some centres presented very brief if any supporting materials. This led to more significant lenience in the assessment of criteria related to the learners' understanding of the development process and consideration of alternatives. Learners continue to sometimes erroneously present background research essays into the theme of their project, rather than a narrative of the creative development process.

There was sometimes lenience in the assessment of AO3 when shorter development and realisation phases did not reflect the increased weighting allotted to this objective. There was less recognition of the necessity for learners to undertake a multistage

development process and interrogate alternatives, before refining the outcome through test pieces or prototypes.

Some centres appear to be over-rewarding the outcome. This was particularly the case when there was less evidence of the process presented in the supporting materials. The quality of the outcome was also sometimes over-rewarded.

#### **AO4**

Oral Presentation Records and copies of the presentation slides were usually included. Where there was slight leniency against AO4, centre assessors could often better consider the full range of marks in the top band. The quality of review tended to be over-rewarded.

At the top end, high-level review and insight was embedded throughout the portfolio. More detailed written summative review tended to enable learners to demonstrate the top band criteria. When the summative review was briefer and assessor comments suggested there was more evidence in the presentation, this could have been more robustly demonstrated through the inclusion of speakers notes/scripts or a recording.

#### **Centre Performance**

Most centres were accurate or slightly lenient in their assessment of P304. There was generally clear evidence of the internal moderation of marks.

AO3 was most likely to be leniently assessed, and when the content and/or outcome reflected band 2 rather than band 3.

Centres are encouraged to ensure they access their E9 report, as this will enable them to address any issues and guard against the upward creep of marks.

The Learner Work Transfer System was used by most for the first time. Centres are advised to double check that the uploaded electronic evidence includes all items listed as Project Contents on the Candidate Record Sheet. The following issues were quite common and should be addressed:

- documents not fully scanned and so pages omitted
- an excessive number of individual documents per learner, with photographs of individual pages of evidence, rather than a single PDF or film of visual evidence.

Some centres did not upload a complete sample, including the work of the highest and lowest marked student. There was varied practice in the labelling of electronic documents and centres are advised to ensure they read the guidance.

Most centres linked their teacher assessor comments to the language of the assessment criteria on the Candidate Record Sheet as required, rather than providing personal qualitative judgments.

Centres are commended for continuing to support the very wide-ranging interests of enthused learners.

